



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,106	11/30/2001	Jeff M. Anderson	10006911-1	5396
7590	01/26/2005		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P. O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			NGUYEN, PHU K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2671	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/010,106	ANDERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Phu K. Nguyen	Art Unit 2671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5,8 and 11-28 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5,8 and 11-28 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Phu Nguyen

PHU K. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2400

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-5, 8, and 11-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SAVOIE (6,571,051) in view of BEADLE et al. (6,842,897).

As per claim 1, Savoie teaches the claimed image editing device (Savoie, figure 1, column 1, lines 22-26) comprising "an image editing program" (Savoie, column 3, lines 43-45) "a lower resolution proxy of a higher resolution image" (Savoie, column 3, lines 29-32; column 1, lines 33-36), the image editing program generating a batch of commands corresponding to edits made on the proxy" (Savoie, column 3, lines 51-54).

It is noted that Savoie does not explicitly teach "a server which provides the application program and data to a client" as claimed; instead, Savoie's application program and data are provided in the video tape recorder 101 and the floppy disc drive 107. Baedle teaches that the transmitting of application program and data from the server to a client is well known (Baedle, column 4, lines 7-9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teaching of Baedle, to configure Savoie's system as claimed by provide the edit program and data on-line to the client by a server because it will reduce the need to installing the edit programs on the client's system and enhances the resource of edit programs run in the client's computer by linking a plurality of stand-alone systems (Baedle, column 4, lines 16-10).

Claim 2 adds into claim 1 "programmed to await the receipt of a batch of commands" which Savoie teaches in column 6, lines 25-30 (Savoie system 301 processes the full resolution video data from the command list prepared in the remote system 101 with the lower resolution video data). It is noted that Savoie does not explicitly teach "a server which provides the application program and data to a client" as claimed; instead, Savoie's application program and data are provided in the video tape recorder 101 and the floppy disc drive 107. Baedle teaches that the transmitting of application program and data from the server to a client is well known (Baedle, column 4, lines 7-9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teaching of Baedle, to configure Savoie's system as claimed by provide the edit program and data on-line to the client by a server because it will reduce the need to

installing the edit programs on the client's system and enhances the resource of edit programs run in the client's computer by linking a plurality of stand-alone systems (Baedle, column 4, lines 16-10).

Claim 3 adds into claim 2 "programmed to receive a batch of commands from the client and use the batch of commands to edit the higher resolution version of the proxy" which Savoie teaches in column 6, lines 25-30 (Savoie system 301 processes the full resolution video data from the command list prepared in the remote system 101 with the lower resolution video data). It is noted that Savoie does not explicitly teach "a server which provides the application program and data to a client" as claimed; instead, Savoie's application program and data are provided in the video tape recorder 101 and the floppy disc drive 107. Baedle teaches that the transmitting of application program and data from the server to a client is well known (Baedle, column 4, lines 7-9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teaching of Baedle, to configure Savoie's system as claimed by provide the edit program and data on-line to the client by a server because it will reduce the need to installing the edit programs on the client's system and enhances the resource of edit programs run in the client's computer by linking a plurality of stand-alone systems (Baedle, column 4, lines 16-10).

Claim 4 adds into claim 3 "programmed to store the commands that have been received as an edit history" which Savoie teaches in column 5, lines 31-32.

Claim 5 adds into claim 4 "the server is programmed to use the edit history to roll back changes in response to a request by the client" which the cited references do not teach. However, it would have been obvious to use the edit list to roll back changes because Savoie stores all the EDL in the memory 302 and these EDL can be modified to roll back changes as decided (column 7, lines 2-42) to recover the original data.

As per claim 8, Savoie teaches the claimed image editing device (Savoie, figure 1, column 1, lines 22-26) "means for transmitting a lower resolution proxy of a higher resolution image to a client" (Savoie, column 3, lines 29-32; column 1, lines 33-36), the image editing program generating a batch of commands corresponding to edits made on the proxy" " (Savoie, column 3, lines 43-45, and 51-54). It is noted that Savoie does not explicitly teach "a server which provides the application program and data to a client" as claimed; instead, Savoie's application program and data are provided in the video tape recorder 101 and the floppy disc drive 107. Baedle teaches that the transmitting of application program and data from the server to a client is well known (Baedle, column 4, lines 7-9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teaching of Baedle, to configure Savoie's system as claimed by provide the edit program and data on-line to the client by a server because it will reduce

the need to installing the edit programs on the client's system and enhances the resource of edit programs run in the client's computer by linking a plurality of stand-alone systems (Baedle, column 4, lines 16-10).

As per claim 11, Savoie teaches the claimed image editing device (Savoie, figure 1, column 1, lines 22-26) "to perform image edits on a proxy of a high resolution image" (Savoie, column 3, lines 29-32; column 1, lines 33-36); "generate commands corresponding to edits made on the proxy" (Savoie, column 3, lines 51-54; column 7, lines 7-9); and "upload the commands as a batch" (Savoie, column 3, lines 43-45, and 51-54). It is noted that Savoie does not explicitly teach "a server which provides the application program and data to a client" as claimed; instead, Savoie's application program and data are provided in the video tape recorder 101 and the floppy disc drive 107. Baedle teaches that the transmitting of application program and data from the server to a client is well known (Baedle, column 4, lines 7-9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teaching of Baedle, to configure Savoie's system as claimed by provide the edit program and data on-line to the client by a server because it will reduce the need to installing the edit programs on the client's system and enhances the resource of edit programs run in the client's computer by linking a plurality of stand-alone systems (Baedle, column 4, lines 16-10).

Claim 12 adds into claim 11 "performing the image edits by displaying the proxy, receiving image edit inputs" (Savoie, column 3, lines 29-36); "overlaying a grid on the

proxy, and using grid elements to compute commands in response to the image edit inputs" which the cited references do not teach. However, it would have been obvious, given the teaching of Savoie's editing full version of image data from the EDL of a lower version (column 6, lines 25-30), to configure the system as claimed by using a grid because the use of a grid provides a visual scaling representation of image in a certain resolution and improves the quality of the edited image through observation of the data in a grid coordinate when creating the edit decision list. It is noted that Savoie does not explicitly teach "a server which provides the application program and data to a client" as claimed; instead, Savoie's application program and data are provided in the video tape recorder 101 and the floppy disc drive 107. Baedle teaches that the transmitting of application program and data from the server to a client is well known (Baedle, column 4, lines 7-9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teaching of Baedle, to configure Savoie's system as claimed by provide the edit program and data on-line to the client by a server because it will reduce the need to installing the edit programs on the client's system and enhances the resource of edit programs run in the client's computer by linking a plurality of stand-alone systems (Baedle, column 4, lines 16-10).

Claims 13-15 claim a network client, a system, and an image-editing program based on the computing apparatus of claim 1; therefore, they are rejected under the same reason.

Claims 16-17 claim an article for network client based on the computing apparatus of claims 1-5, therefore, they are rejected under the same reason.

Claims 18-20 claim an article for server based on the computing apparatus of claims 1-5, therefore, they are rejected under the same reason.

Claim 21 adds into claim 20 "to use the edit history to roll back changes in response to a request" which Savoie teaches in column 6, lines 42-48. It is noted that Savoie does not explicitly teach "a server which provides the application program and data to a client" as claimed; instead, Savoie's application program and data are provided in the video tape recorder 101 and the floppy disc drive 107. Baedle teaches that the transmitting of application program and data from the server to a client is well known (Baedle, column 4, lines 7-9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teaching of Baedle, to configure Savoie's system as claimed by provide the edit program and data on-line to the client by a server because it will reduce the need to installing the edit programs on the client's system and enhances the resource of edit programs run in the client's computer by linking a plurality of stand-alone systems (Baedle, column 4, lines 16-10).

Claims 22-23 claim method of performing on-line editing based on the computing apparatus of claims 1-5, therefore, they are rejected under a same reason.

Claims 24-27 claim method of performing on-line editing based on the computing apparatus of claims 1-5, therefore, they are rejected under a same reason.

Claim 28 adds into claim 27 "using the edit history to roll back changes in response to a request" which Savoie teaches in column 6, lines 42-48. It is noted that Savoie does not explicitly teach "a server which provides the application program and data to a client" as claimed; instead, Savoie's application program and data are provided in the video tape recorder 101 and the floppy disc drive 107. Baedle teaches that the transmitting of application program and data from the server to a client is well known (Baedle, column 4, lines 7-9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teaching of Baedle, to configure Savoie's system as claimed by provide the edit program and data on-line to the client by a server because it will reduce the need to installing the edit programs on the client's system and enhances the resource of edit programs run in the client's computer by linking a plurality of stand-alone systems (Baedle, column 4, lines 16-10).

Due to new ground of the rejection cited above, this action has been made NON-FINAL.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu K. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703)305 - 9796. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phu K. Nguyen

January 19, 2005

Phu Nguyen
PHU K. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2400